

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

CLARENCE DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:25-cv-00630-LK

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION

This matter comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of United States Magistrate Judge David W. Christel. Dkt. No. 5. On April 7, 2025, Plaintiff Clarence Davis filed a prisoner civil rights complaint against Defendants Snohomish County and Snohomish County Public Defenders. Dkt. No. 1 at 1. On April 10, 2025, the Clerk sent Mr. Davis a Notice of Filing Deficiency, noting that Mr. Davis had not paid the filing fee or sought leave to proceed in forma pauperis (“IFP”). Dkt. No. 4 at 1. The Clerk informed Mr. Davis that these deficiencies had to be corrected by May 12, 2025, and cautioned him that the failure to do so “may affect the status of [his] case, including dismissal of the action by the Court.” *Id.*

1 On May 29, 2025, Judge Christel issued an R&R, recommending that the Court dismiss  
2 this action without prejudice because “[t]he deadline to pay the filing fee or apply to proceed IFP  
3 has elapsed with nothing received from Plaintiff.” Dkt. No. 5 at 1. Any objections to the R&R  
4 were due by June 13, 2025. *Id.* at 2. Mr. Davis did not file objections or request an extension of  
5 time to do so.

6 When considering Judge Christel’s R&R, the Court “shall make a de novo determination  
7 of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which  
8 objection is made,” and “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or  
9 recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P.  
10 72(b)(3). As the statute and rule suggest, the Court reviews findings and recommendations “*if*  
11 *objection is made*, but not otherwise.” *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir.  
12 2003) (en banc) (“Neither the Constitution nor the statute requires a district judge to review, de  
13 novo, findings and recommendations that the parties themselves accept as correct.”).

14 No objections having been filed, and based on an independent review of the record, the  
15 Court concurs with Judge Christel that dismissal without prejudice is warranted because Mr. Davis  
16 has not paid the filing fee, applied to proceed IFP, or otherwise responded to the Notice of Filing  
17 Deficiency. Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS the R&R, Dkt. No. 5, and DISMISSES this case  
18 without prejudice for failure to pay the filing fee or seek leave to proceed IFP. The Clerk is directed  
19 to send copies of this Order to Mr. Davis at his last known address and to Judge Christel.

20 Dated this 16th day of June, 2025.

21 

22 Lauren King  
23 United States District Judge  
24